

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,384
Docket No.: 07123-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The abstract of the disclosure exceeds 150 words in length, and the form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims should be avoided therein. Accordingly, appropriate corrections of the abstract in the proper language and format are required.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,570,368, hereinafter referred to as "Murakami et al.") in view of Witel et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,721,336, hereinafter "Witel et al."). Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. in view of Nishida et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,966,447, hereinafter "Nishida et al."). Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. in view of Diaz et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,537,400, hereinafter "Diaz et al.").

Claims 2-20 and 22-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response thereto, applicants have amended the abstract to be in a narrative form and not to exceed 150 words in length. Claim 1 has been amended to include allowable subject matter contained in the originally-filed claim 2, and claim 2 is subsequently canceled. Claims 11 and 12 have been correspondingly revised due to the dependency of the cancelled claim 2. Further, claim 21 has been amended to incorporate allowable subject matter in the as-filed claim 22, and thus claim 22 is cancelled.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,384
Docket No.: 07123-US-PA

It is believed that no new matter is added by way of amendments made to claims or abstract or otherwise to the application. After entry of the foregoing amendments, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-21, 23-27 patently define over prior art of record and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. in view of Witel et al. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. in view of Nishida et al. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. in view of Diaz et al.

In response thereto, applicants have incorporated the allowable subject matter recited in claim 2 to claim 1 and subsequently canceled claim 2. Dependent claims 11 and 12 are also revised because of the dependency upon claim 2. As such, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 1, submitting that Murakami et al. and Witel et al. neither taken alone nor in combination possibly render every feature of the amended independent claim 1 which should accordingly be allowed.

In addition, claim 21 has been amended to include allowable subject matter in the as-filed claim 22, and claim 22 is cancelled in sequence. After entry of said amendment, applicants respectfully submit that Murakami et al. and Nishida et al. neither taken alone nor in combination possibly render every feature of the amended independent claim 21. Thus, claim 21 ought to be allowable.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,384
Docket No.: 07123-US-PA

With the indicated allowable subject matter added to claim 21, the currently amended independent claim 21 and its dependent claim 27 are both submitted to be novel and unobvious over Murakami et al. in view of Nishida et al, and further in view of Diaz et al., or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Claims 3-20 and 23-26, which depend from Claims 1 and 21, directly or indirectly, are also patentable over Murakami et al. in view of Witel et al. or in view of Nishida et al., at least because of their dependency upon an allowable base claim. As such, if independent claims 1 and 21 are allowable over the prior art of record, their dependent claims 3-20 and 23-26 are allowable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is therefore submitted that claims 1, 3-21, 23-27 patently define over any of the citations described herein, taken along or in combination, and thus should be allowed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,384
Docket No.: 07123-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1, 3-21, 23-27 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

March 30 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw
Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw